

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO. 25-CV-22171-RAR

SPIKE CABLE NETWORKS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

**THE INDIVIDUALS, BUSINESS ENTITIES,
AND UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS
IDENTIFIED ON SCHEDULE “A,”**

Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR DEFAULT FINAL JUDGMENT

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court upon Plaintiff’s Motion for Entry of Default Final Judgment (“Motion”), [ECF No. 45]. Plaintiff Spike Cable Networks Inc. (“Plaintiff”) seeks entry of a default final judgment against Defendants,¹ the Individuals, Business Entities, and Unincorporated Associations identified on Schedule “A” (“Defendants”) that operate e-commerce stores that infringe Plaintiff’s trademarks and promote and sell counterfeit goods bearing and/or using Plaintiff’s trademarks. *See generally* Mot. Plaintiff requests that the Court: (1) enjoin Defendants from producing or selling goods that infringe its trademarks; (2) cancel, or at Plaintiff’s election, transfer the e-commerce stores at issue to Plaintiff; (3) assign all rights, title, and interest

¹ Plaintiff has not included Defendants, ghelter.com (Defendant Number 31) and novitaregali.com (Defendant Number 34), in the Motion’s request for relief as Consent Final Judgment and Permanent Injunctions were entered as to these Defendants. *See* [ECF Nos. 36, 38]. Additionally, Defendants, anurvogel.com (Defendant Number 4) and cotosen.com (Defendant Number 5) have not been included in Plaintiff’s request for relief as these Defendants were not subject to the Clerk’s Default entered. Further, Plaintiff has not included Defendants, topiy.com (Defendant Number 2) and aeety.com (Defendant Number 12), in its request for relief as Plaintiff is engaged in settlement discussions with those Defendants. Accordingly, this Order refers to the remaining Defendants identified on Schedule “A,” attached to this Order, and does not apply to Defendants ghelter.com (Defendant Number 31), novitaregali.com (Defendant Number 34), anurvogel.com (Defendant Number 4), cotosen.com (Defendant Number 5), topiy.com (Defendant Number 2), and aeety.com (Defendant Number 12).

to the e-commerce stores to Plaintiff and permanently disable, delist or deindex the websites' uniform resource locators ("URLs") and e-commerce stores from all Internet search engines; (4) authorize Plaintiff to request any e-mail service provider permanently suspend the e-mail addresses which are or have been used by Defendants in connection with Defendants' promotion, offering for sale, and/or sale of goods bearing counterfeits of Plaintiff's trademarks; and (5) award statutory damages. *See generally id.*


A Clerk's Default, [ECF No. 43], was entered against Defendants on July 31, 2025, after Defendants failed to respond to the Amended Complaint, [ECF No. 27], despite having been served. *See* Proof of Service, [ECF No. 30]. The Court having considered the record and noting no opposition to the Motion, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff's Motion, [ECF No. 45], is **GRANTED** for the reasons stated herein.



BACKGROUND²

A. Factual Background

Plaintiff is the owner of the following trademarks, which are valid and registered on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (collectively, the "YELLOWSTONE Marks"):

Trademark	Registration Number	Registration Date	Class(es)/Good(s)
	7,093,865	June 27, 2023	IC 025: Clothing, namely, shirts, t-shirts, sweatshirts, sweaters, blouses, pants, jeans, trousers, shorts, suits, underwear, pajamas, jackets, coats, vests, socks, stockings, tights, dresses, skirts,

² The factual background is taken from Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, [ECF No. 27], the Motion for Entry of Default Final Judgment, [ECF No. 45], and supporting evidentiary submissions.

			headwear, namely, hats, caps, beanies, visors, headbands, bandanas; clothing accessories, namely, belts, ties, gloves, mittens, scarves; footwear; Halloween costumes
	7,239,237	December 12, 2023	IC 021: Mugs
	7,239,238	December 12, 2023	IC 025: Hats; Clothing, namely, shirts, t-shirts, sweatshirts, hoodies, vests; baby clothes, namely, pajamas, jackets, shirts, pants, jumper coveralls

See Decl. of Mallory Levitt (“Levitt Decl.”), [ECF No. 8-1] ¶ 5. The YELLOWSTONE Marks are registered on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office and are used in connection with the manufacture and distribution of high-quality goods in the categories identified above. *See id.* ¶¶ 5–6.

Plaintiff’s representative reviewed and visually inspected the detailed web page captures and images of the various branded products ordered from each Defendant via its respective Internet based e-commerce store(s) operating under or through the seller name(s) identified on Schedule “A” (the “E-commerce Store Names”) and determined each product to be a non-genuine, unauthorized version of Plaintiff’s branded product. *See* Levitt Decl. ¶¶ 12–15; Levitt Decl. Ex. 1, [ECF No. 8-2]. Based on its investigation, Plaintiff alleges Defendants have advertised, promoted, offered for sale, or sold goods bearing and/or using what Plaintiff has determined to be counterfeits, infringements, reproductions, or colorable imitations of the YELLOWSTONE Marks. *See id.*; *see also* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 17–23, 33. Defendants are not now, nor have they ever been, authorized or licensed to use, reproduce, or make counterfeits, reproductions, or colorable imitations of the YELLOWSTONE Marks. *See* Levitt Decl. ¶¶ 10, 13, 15.

B. Procedural Background

On May 12, 2025, Plaintiff filed its Complaint, [ECF No. 1], and on July 7, 2025, filed its Amended Complaint, [ECF No. 27], against Defendants. On May 27, 2025, Plaintiff filed its *Ex Parte* Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process (“Motion for Alternate Service”), [ECF No. 9]. The Court entered an Order Granting the Motion for Alternate Service on June 24, 2025 [ECF No. 12, docketed June 25, 2025]. In accordance with the June 24, 2025 Order, Plaintiff served each Defendant with a Summons and a copy of the Amended Complaint via electronic mail and website posting on July 8, 2025. *See* Decl. of Stephen M. Gaffigan (“Gaffigan Decl.”), [ECF No. 45-3] ¶ 6; Proof of Service, [ECF No. 30].

Defendants failed to file an answer or other response, and the time allowed for Defendants to respond to the Amended Complaint has since expired. *See* Gaffigan Decl. ¶¶ 7–8. To Plaintiff’s knowledge, Defendants are not infants or incompetent persons, and the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act does not apply. *See id.* at ¶ 9. On July 31, 2025, the Clerk entered Default against Defendants, [ECF No. 43], for failure to plead or otherwise defend pursuant to Rule 55(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff now moves the Court for default final judgment against Defendants.

LEGAL STANDARD

A party may apply to the court for a default judgment when the defendant fails to timely respond to a pleading. FED. R. CIV. P. 55(b)(2). “A defendant, by his default, admits the plaintiff’s well-pleaded allegations of fact, is concluded on those facts by the judgment, and is barred from contesting on appeal the facts thus established.” *Eagle Hosp. Physicians, LLC v. SRG Consulting, Inc.*, 561 F.3d 1298, 1307 (11th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Nishimatsu Const. Co. v. Houston Nat’l Bank*, 515 F.2d 1200, 1206 (5th Cir. 1975)). However, conclusions of law are to be determined by the court. *See Mierzwicki v. CAB Asset Management LLC*, No. 14-CV-61998, 2014 WL 12488533, at

*1 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 30, 2014). Therefore, a court may only enter a default judgment if there is a “sufficient basis to state a claim.” *Id.* (citing *Nishimatsu*, 515 F.2d at 1206).

Once a plaintiff has established a sufficient basis for liability, the Court must conduct an inquiry to determine the appropriate damages. *PetMed Express, Inc. v. MedPets.Com, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d 1213, 1217 (S.D. Fla. 2004) (citations omitted). Although an evidentiary hearing is generally required, the Court need not conduct such a hearing “when . . . additional evidence would be truly unnecessary to a fully informed determination of damages.” *Safari Programs, Inc. v. CollectA Int’l Ltd.*, 686 F. App’x 737, 746 (11th Cir. 2017) (quoting *SEC v. Smyth*, 420 F.3d 1225, 1232 n.13 (11th Cir. 2005)). Therefore, where the record adequately supports the award of damages, an evidentiary hearing is not required. *See Smyth*, 420 F.3d at 1232 n.13; *PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1217 (finding an evidentiary hearing unnecessary because plaintiff was seeking statutory damages under the Lanham Act); *Luxottica Grp. S.p.A. v. Casa Los Martinez Corp.*, No. 14-CV-22859, 2014 WL 4948632, at *2 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 2, 2014) (same).

ANALYSIS

A. Claims

Plaintiff seeks a default judgment for the relief sought in the Amended Complaint, asserting the following claims against Defendants: (1) trademark counterfeiting and infringement under section 32 of the Lanham Act, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114 (“Claim 1”); (2) false designation of origin under section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) (“Claim 2”); (3) unfair competition under Florida common law (“Claim 3”); and (4) trademark infringement under Florida common law (“Claim 4”). *See* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 49–74.

1. Counterfeiting and Infringement

Section 32 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114, provides liability for trademark

infringement if, without the consent of the registrant, a defendant uses “in commerce any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of a registered mark . . . which . . . is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.” 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a). To prevail on its trademark infringement claim, a plaintiff must demonstrate “(1) that it had prior rights to the mark at issue and (2) that the defendant had adopted a mark or name that was the same, or confusingly similar to its mark, such that consumers were likely to confuse the two.” *Planetary Motion, Inc. v. Techsplosion, Inc.*, 261 F.3d 1188, 1193 (11th Cir. 2001) (footnote and citations omitted).

2. False Designation of Origin

The test for liability for false designation of origin under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) is the same as for a trademark counterfeiting and infringement claim—*i.e.*, whether the public is likely to be deceived or confused by the similarity of the marks at issue. *See Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc.*, 505 U.S. 763, 780 (1992) (Stevens, J., concurring in the judgment).

3. Common Law Unfair Competition

Whether a defendant’s use of a plaintiff’s trademarks created a likelihood of confusion between the plaintiff’s and the defendant’s products is also the determining factor in the analysis of unfair competition under the common law of Florida. *See Rolex Watch U.S.A., Inc. v. Forrester*, No. 83-CV-8381, 1986 WL 15668, at *3–4 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 9, 1986) (“[I]t is clear that the Court need not find ‘actual confusion[.]’ . . . The proper test is ‘likelihood of confusion[.]’”).

4. Common Law Trademark Infringement

The analysis of liability for Florida common law trademark infringement is the same as the analysis of liability for trademark infringement under section 32(a) of the Lanham Act. *See PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1217–18.

B. Liability

The well-pleaded factual allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint properly contain the elements for each of the above claims and are admitted by virtue of Defendants' defaults. *See* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 17–23, 33–45, 50–54, 57–62, 65–67, 70–73. Moreover, the Amended Complaint's factual allegations have been substantiated by sworn declarations and other evidence and establish Defendants' liability for each of the claims asserted. Accordingly, default judgment pursuant to Rule 55 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is appropriately entered against Defendants.

C. Relief

Plaintiff requests an award of equitable relief and monetary damages against Defendants for trademark infringement in Claim 1. The Court analyzes Plaintiff's request for relief as to Claim 1 only, as the judgment for Claims 2, 3, and 4—false designation of origin, common law unfair competition, and common law trademark infringement—is limited to entry of the requested equitable relief for Claim 1. *See generally* Mot.

1. Injunctive Relief

Pursuant to the Lanham Act, a district court is authorized to issue an injunction “according to the principles of equity and upon such terms as the court may deem reasonable,” to prevent violations of trademark law. 15 U.S.C. § 1116(a). Indeed, “[i]njunctive relief is the remedy of choice for trademark and unfair competition cases, since there is no adequate remedy at law for the injury caused by a defendant's continuing infringement.” *Burger King Corp. v. Agad*, 911 F. Supp. 1499, 1509–10 (S.D. Fla. 1995) (alteration in original) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin*, 846 F.2d 1175, 1180 (9th Cir. 1988)). Injunctive relief is available even in the default judgment setting, *see, e.g., PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1222–23, because Defendants' failure to respond or otherwise appear makes it difficult for a plaintiff to prevent

further infringement absent an injunction. *See Jackson v. Sturkie*, 255 F. Supp. 2d 1096, 1103 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (“[D]efendant’s lack of participation in this litigation has given the court no assurance that defendant’s infringing activity will cease. Therefore, plaintiff is entitled to permanent injunctive relief.”).

Permanent injunctive relief is appropriate where a plaintiff demonstrates: (1) it has suffered irreparable injury; (2) there is no adequate remedy at law; (3) the balance of hardship favors an equitable remedy; and (4) an issuance of an injunction is in the public’s interest. *See eBay, Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC*, 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006). Plaintiff has carried its burden on each of the four factors.

Specifically, in trademark cases, “a sufficiently strong showing of likelihood of confusion [caused by trademark infringement] may by itself constitute a showing of . . . a substantial threat of irreparable harm.” *E. Remy Martin & Co., S.A. v. Shaw-Ross Int’l Imp., Inc.*, 756 F.2d 1525, 1530 (11th Cir. 1985) (alterations added) (footnote omitted); *see also Levi Strauss & Co. v. Sunrise Int’l Trading Inc.*, 51 F.3d 982, 986 (11th Cir. 1995) (“There is no doubt that the continued sale of thousands of pairs of counterfeit jeans would damage [the plaintiff’s] business reputation and decrease its legitimate sales.”). Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint and the submissions show that the goods produced and sold by Defendants are nearly identical to Plaintiff’s genuine products, and consumers viewing Defendants’ counterfeit goods post-sale would actually confuse them for Plaintiff’s genuine products. *See, e.g., Am. Compl.* ¶ 34 (“Defendants’ actions is likely to cause confusion of consumers, at the time of initial interest, sale, and in the post-sale setting, who will believe all of Defendants’ goods offered for sale in or through Defendants’ e-commerce stores are genuine YELLOWSTONE goods originating from, associated with, and/or approved by Plaintiff.”).

Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law so long as Defendants continue to operate the E-commerce Store Names because Plaintiff cannot control the quality of what appears to be its products in the marketplace. An award of monetary damages alone will not cure the injury to Plaintiff's reputation and goodwill if Defendants' infringing and counterfeiting continue. Moreover, Plaintiff faces hardship from loss of sales and its inability to control its reputation in the marketplace. By contrast, Defendants face no hardship if they are prohibited from the infringement of Plaintiff's trademarks. Finally, the public interest supports the issuance of a permanent injunction against Defendants to prevent consumers from being misled by Defendants' products and potentially harmed by their inferior quality. *See Chanel, Inc. v. besumart.com*, 240 F. Supp. 3d 1238, 1291 (S.D. Fla. 2016) (“[A]n injunction to enjoin infringing behavior serves the public interest in protecting consumers from such behavior.”) (citation omitted); *World Wrestling Entm’t, Inc. v. Thomas*, No. 12-CIV-21018, 2012 WL 12874190, at *8 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 11, 2012) (considering the potential for harm based on exposure to potentially hazardous counterfeit merchandise in analyzing public's interest in an injunction).

Broad equity powers allow the Court to fashion injunctive relief necessary to stop Defendants' infringing activities. *See, e.g., Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.*, 402 U.S. 1, 15 (1971) (“Once a right and a violation have been shown, the scope of a district court's equitable powers to remedy past wrongs is broad, for breadth and flexibility are inherent in equitable remedies. The essence of equity jurisdiction has been the power of the Chancellor to do equity and to mould [sic] each decree to the necessities of the particular case.” (citation modified)); *United States v. Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.*, 321 U.S. 707, 724 (1944) (“Equity has power to eradicate the evils of a condemned scheme by prohibition of the use of admittedly valid parts of an invalid whole.” (citations omitted)).

Defendants have created a counterfeiting scheme in which they are profiting from their deliberate misappropriation of Plaintiff's rights. Accordingly, the Court may fashion injunctive relief to eliminate the means by which Defendants are conducting their unlawful activities. Appropriate remedies to achieve this end include canceling or transferring the E-commerce Store Names; assigning all rights, title, and interest to the E-commerce Store Names to Plaintiff and disabling, delisting or deindexing the websites' URLs and E-commerce Store Names from any Internet search engine; and suspending the e-mail addresses used by Defendants, such that these means may no longer be used as instrumentalities to further the sale of counterfeit goods.

2. Statutory Damages

In a case involving the use of counterfeit marks in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of goods, 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c) provides that a plaintiff may elect an award of statutory damages at any time before final judgment is rendered in the sum of not less than \$1,000.00 nor more than \$200,000.00 per counterfeit mark per type of good. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c)(1). In addition, if the Court finds Defendants' counterfeiting actions were willful, it may impose damages above the maximum limit up to \$2,000,000.00 per counterfeit mark per type of good. *See id.* § 1117(c)(2).

The Court has wide discretion to determine the amount of statutory damages. *See PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1219 (citing *Cable/Home Commc'n Corp. v. Network Prods., Inc.*, 902 F.2d 829, 852 (11th Cir. 1990)). An award of statutory damages is appropriate despite a plaintiff's inability to prove actual damages caused by a defendant's infringement. *See Ford Motor Co. v. Cross*, 441 F. Supp. 2d 837, 852 (E.D. Mich. 2006); *Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Universal Tel-A-Talk, Inc.*, No. 96-CV-6961, 1998 WL 767440, at *8 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 3, 1998) (awarding statutory damages where plaintiff failed to prove actual damages or profits). The option of a statutory

damages remedy in trademark counterfeiting cases is sensible given evidence of a defendant's profits in such cases is frequently almost impossible to ascertain. *See, e.g.*, S. Rep. No. 104-177, pt. V § 7, at 10 (1995) (discussing purposes of Lanham Act statutory damages); *PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1220 (statutory damages are “[e]specially appropriate in default judgment cases due to infringer nondisclosure”) (citations omitted). This case is no exception.

Here, the allegations of the Amended Complaint and the evidence establish that Defendants intentionally copied one or more of the YELLOWSTONE Marks for the purpose of deriving the benefit of Plaintiff's world-famous reputation. Defendants have defaulted on Plaintiff's allegations of willfulness. *See* Am. Compl. ¶ 40; *see also* *Arista Records, Inc. v. Beker Enters., Inc.*, 298 F. Supp. 2d 1310, 1313 (S.D. Fla. 2003) (finding a court may infer willfulness from the defendants' default) (citations omitted); *PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1217 (stating that upon default, well-pleaded allegations are taken as true). As such, the Lanham Act permits the Court to award up to \$2,000,000.00 per infringing mark on each type of good as statutory damages to ensure Defendants do not continue their intentional and willful counterfeiting activities.

The only available evidence demonstrates that each Defendant promoted, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and/or sold at least one (1) type of good bearing at least one (1) mark which is a counterfeit of at least one of the YELLOWSTONE Marks protected by federal trademark registrations. *See* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 24, 33–35; Levitt Decl. ¶¶ 5, 10–15; Ex. 1 to the Levitt Decl.; *see also* Declaration of Mallory Levitt in Support of Plaintiff's Motion (“Levitt Decl. in Support of Motion”), [ECF No. 45-1] ¶ 5; Levitt Decl. in Support of Motion Ex. 1 [ECF No. 45-2], Statutory Damages Calculation Chart. Based on the above considerations, Plaintiff has asked the Court to award statutory damages in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 per mark, per type of good. *See* Mot. 14–15. As each Defendant used at least one counterfeit mark on one type of good, Plaintiff

requests a statutory damages award in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 against each Defendant. *See id.* The award should be sufficient to deter Defendants and others from continuing to counterfeit or otherwise infringe Plaintiff's trademarks, compensate Plaintiff, and punish Defendants, all stated goals of 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c). The Court finds that this award of statutory damages falls within the permissible range under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c) and is just. *See Chanel, Inc. v. Individuals, Bus. Entities, & Unincorporated Ass'ns*, No. 25-21839 (S.D. Fla. July 14, 2025), ECF No. 45 (awarding plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each defendant based on at least two marks counterfeited on one type of good); *Yeti Coolers, LLC v. Individuals, Bus. Entities, & Unincorporated Ass'ns*, No. 24-24499 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 26, 2025), ECF No. 39 (awarding plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each defendant per mark counterfeited per type of good); *Abercrombie & Fitch Trading Co. v. Individuals*, No. 24-24707 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 13, 2025), ECF No. 34 (awarding plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each defendant); *Chanel, Inc. v. Individuals, Bus. Entities, & Unincorporated Ass'ns*, No. 23-62201 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 5, 2024), ECF No. 34 (awarding the plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each defendant); *Omega SA v. Individuals, Bus. Entities, & Unincorporated Ass'ns*, No. 23-60410 (S.D. Fla. April 29, 2023), ECF No. 30 (awarding plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each defendant).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff is entitled to the entry of default final judgment. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff's Motion, [ECF No. 45], is **GRANTED**. Default final judgment and a permanent injunction shall be entered by separate order.

DONE AND ORDERED in Miami, Florida, this ____ day of _____, 2025.

RODOLFO A. RUIZ II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SCHEDULE “A”
DEFENDANTS BY NUMBER, E-COMMERCE STORE NAME,
FINANCIAL ACCOUNT INFORMATION, AND MEANS OF CONTACT

Def. No.	Defendant / E-commerce Store Name	PayPal Payee	Merchant ID / Transaction Information	PayPal E-mail	Means of Contact
1	rasotee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		vivushirt.com@gmail.com
1	fasatee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		vivushirt.com@gmail.com
1	zahatee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	zemzotee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	hamptee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		vivushirt.com@gmail.com
1	hectee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		hectee.com@gmail.com
1	illintee.com	Nguyen Phong Phu	5SY8VZ4XN D2MW EJW6CGCUP PFPU	sbosutee@gmail.com	nhuhataza@gmail.com support@illintee.com
1	uztee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	vesatee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	virgitee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		vivushirt.com@gmail.com
1	bocotee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		hectee.com@gmail.com
1	bunatee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		bunatee.com@gmail.com
1	larotee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		bunatee.com@gmail.com
1	nevetee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		teecandal.com@gmail.com
1	palotee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	vivushirt.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW EJW6CGCUP PFPU		vivushirt.com@gmail.com support@vivushirt.com
1	teecandal.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		teecandal.com@gmail.com

1	fidotee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	riete.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		bunatee.com@gmail.com
1	asetee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	bevatee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	myzete.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	furatee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		teecandal.com@gmail.com
1	zagatee.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
1	miteeta.com		5SY8VZ4XN D2MW		nhuhataza@gmail.com
2	N/A				
3	aixpi-ring-light.com	深圳市 爱享派 电子商 务有限 公司	UCXJPVTWJ2 V6C		sale@aixpi.com support@aixpi.com
		深圳市 卓旺科 技有限 公司	PKAQAVATS QATJ		
4	N/A				
5	N/A				
6	teepanda.net	Teepanda - Best gifts your whole family	7YECEP9LSY PP2		support@teepanda.net
7	theaffordablesshirt.com	cloudtees design		cloudteesdesign. cs@gmail.com	theaffordablesshirt@gmail.com admin@theaffordablesshirt.com
		Anas Buchori	JQJ9ZRYXB4 FPS		
8	bucktee.com	Stripe Payment	IFROGTEES Transaction Date: June 27, 2024 Posted Date: June 28, 2024		support@bucktee.com

			Category: Merchandise & inventory		
9	perfectfittshirts.com	Perfect Fit T Shirts	T6N57JCKJV SDN		PERFECT_FIT_TSHIRTS@Y AHOO.CA dmca@rianzingcom.com
10	2020trendingtees.com		T7RLHJ7LYF BNN		support@2020trendingtees.co m
			PLEB7FTLNV 43U		
11	glieseshirt.com		GKP7HHC7B LJBL		support@glieseshirt.com
11	lealiashirt.com		GKP7HHC7B LJBL		support@lealiashirt.com
12	N/A				
13	hhshirt.com		BDZWGGB76 BWPS		support@hhshirt.com support@mytrendingshirt.com hhshirt@gmail.com
			6TUWRVEH MEE6S		
			K9WJF6GJC WW5J		
13	teeextra.com		BDZWGGB76 BWPS		support@teeextra.com
			RMRQ7GCP MC78Q		
			ZC26EKF45C F3S		
14	neptuneshirt.com		6736SBP7JU9 U4		support@neptuneshirt.com support@mytrendingshirt.com
15	vsgclothing.com		PJW92WSBN YXRE		support@vsgclothing.com
			Y3V7HP3SYP RTJ		
16	247teeshirt.com		EFD3DDTGM 7CSC		support@247teeshirt.com
17	fashionstoreaz.com		UG2B4SA5Q7 8Z4		support@fashionstoreaz.com
		Nguyễn Cao Cường	3GTXCR5DM 5FR6	support@demav os.com	
18	nemopremium.com		B23W6PJTDE DHL		support@nemopremium.com hieu.uel@gmail.com
19	teecify.net		3FXAT47Z6Z RTA		support@Teecify.net
20	inotee.com		DGBT7XAG6 QSSY		vivushirt.com@gmail.com support@inotee.com

21	baetees.com	Wahyuni ngsih	KLBWBC8YD 7DSE		csseller.id@gmail.com
		Sella Fisnanda	TGGD5HGDH VJ36		
		Diptya Adri Baskara	3F97TVE3UX 782		
21	teelooks.com	Wahyuni ngsih	KLBWBC8YD 7DSE		teelooks.shop@gmail.com
		Yanna Kusuma wati	JN8ZFZUSDH G5S		
22	bipubunny.com		7KWHCH8PY SKH2		support@bipubunny.com
23	outfitgod.com	Yanna Kusuma wati	JLJBLYAEVM L7G		cs.outfitgod@gmail.com
		Gede Wijaya	J3XALUQJR2 QSQ		
23	americanteeshop.com	Yanna Kusuma wati	JLJBLYAEVM L7G		americanteeshop323@gmail.com
		WARTI	H89PNQHMF TJAU		
		Rahmat Qubailal Fitri	ZTMHR7MFA 5PJ8		
		Risma Hanna Hafidha	2G47MVGP8 CJF6		
		yoseahe ryanto1@ gmail.co m	YZJXQZ7G6Z R2G		
23	advantees.com	Diptya Adri Baskara	6M5HNY8F2S GYG		cs.advantees@gmail.com
		Gede Wijaya	J3XALUQJR2 QSQ		
24	merchill.com	Merchill. com	8BC9W9HZX YQ9J		support@merchill.com
		Merchill. com	TN5LDG3YA4 SAW		
25	inkinaction.com	Print your thoughts.	9DBMUWK9 CSYXQ		contact@inkinaction.com

		Tell your stories.			
			APQT3WS3F RQU4		
			4RSXM2FQQ ETTW		
			X4ZX89YY5G H4Q		
26	nemoshirt.com		7N23VDBKG WZQN		sales@nemoshirt.com
			5SDPG3TAZH JV4		
27	bestoftees.com	Samantha Daniels	QBM79UJ29U 9RG	bestoftees8@gmail.com	bestoftees8@gmail.com dmca@rianzingcom.com
28	teenavi.com		ZEHEZEFGB RZQQ		contact@teenavi.com
			3FYH6YJXPX THL		
			SHTXW5MLC XENA		
29	ornamentmerch.com	Nguyen Van Anh	RP5Y7JXGA6 CW8		support@ornamentmerch.com
30	onnmerch.com		BGKZBASN6 JBEE		support@ornamentmerch.com
31	N/A				
32	teeforsports.com	teeforsports.com	2VAYHYJKP6 R2C		Teeforsports@gmail.com Quynhanh5985@gmail.com
33	maxxtees.com	Faz Project	FQYYWMZN V2CJG	faizkayabersama@gmail.com	admin@maxxtees.com maxxteesshop@gmail.com
		Fariasi	2CNVD8FDJ9 YAS		
34	N/A				
35	thorshirts.com		FJGB8M9JS5 GU6		support@thorshirts.com support@mytrendingshirt.com
36	shirtelephant.com		RRRY5873LY HRE		support@shirtelephant.com contact@shirtelephant.com info@shirtelephant.com tracking@shirtelephant.com
37	t-shirtbear.com a.k.a tshirtsa.com		BY7JFPZBGY MZW		support@TeeShirtCat.com support@tshirtsa.com tshirtsadotcom@gmail.com
38	yellow-stone.store a.k.a. printyourmerchandise.com	KHOA NGUYE N DANG	NCHABQHM 72S9S		contact@yellow-stone.store support@printyourmerchandise.com invoice3@woocommercinvoice.com

39	nowateeca.com		QMM3AFE57 NWJU		contact.nowateeca@gmail.com nowateeca@gmail.com
		NGO BA HUNG	VW4QX48PY CX3Q	meansayaard@h otmail.com	
			4VVVRP29RH GJ3E		
			8WNB6N6JM TPV8		
40	tshirtatlowprice.com	Tshirt at Low Price	Q3AYVAKW WXPUJ		support@tshirtatlowprice.com customercare@tshirtatlowprice .com
			TALP Transaction Date: March 21, 2025 Posted Date: March 23, 2025 Merchant Type: Family clothing stores Method: Online, mail or phone Category: Merchandise & inventory		
		Stripe Payment			
		Tshirt at Low Price	8J2LYX6W4F 3GL		